UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, July 16, 2019

6:10   CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Andy Wiese

Roll Call:
Members present:
Andy Wiese (AW), Keith Jenne (KJ), Roger Cavnaugh (RC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Debby Knight (DK), Melanie Cohn (MC), George Lattimer (GL), Veronica Ayesta (VA), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Laurie Phillips (LP),

Members not present:
Petr Krysl (PK), Andie Hosch (AH), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson (RR), Jason Morehead (JM), Kristin Camper (KC)

Non-voting Member:
Kristin Camper (KC)

Note: MCAS Miramar representative Kristin Camper does not vote per US Government policy.

City Staff:
Tait Galloway (TG), Dan Monroe (DM), Katie Witherspoon (KW)

Some members of the public are identified below as:
Barry Bernstein   (BB)
Nancy Groves   (NG)
Deanna Ratnikova   (DR)

6:19   APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
Andie Hosch not present - no minutes to approve for 5/21 CPUS
Chris Nielsen (CN) to take minutes in Andie's place for this meeting.

Motion to approve the minutes for the CPUS meeting on June 18, 2019 by LP, with DK second:
        Yes   9 (Including Chair)
        No   0
        Abst.   2 (KR)(JB).

6:17   NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Barry Bernstein:
        Are there any on line survey results?

DM: 1600 responses received. This doubled the previous turnout in other plan areas.
          Results to be posted to the web site in mid-August.
LP: Demographic distribution of responses?

DM: Will have some of that information.
GL: Percentage of eligible?
DM: Might be able to calculate this from the surveys.

6:23   Item 1 INFO ITEM – Mobility Strategy (Pedro Valera (PV) Claudia Brizuela (CB))

PV: Went through basic Community Facts. UCSD figures are included. There has been outreach to increase community participation via the CP survey and other community events.

PV: 93% of employees in UC plan area reside outside UC plan area.

PV: Mobility an important contribution to the CAP.

PV: New Mobility assessment models for pedestrians.

   Look at each intersection and break down the quality of the pedestrian experience there. Then devise strategies that look at land use, location, transit, and so forth. Look at curb extensions, visibility improvement. Traffic lights red while pedestrians are first starting out improves visibility to cars and reduces accidents.

PV: Mobility -- Bicycles

   Identify the status of all bike lanes in the plan area.

   Address discontinuous bike lanes, emphasize low stress routes, intersection control, traffic calming.

   Class 1: Isolated. Scooters would be in the pedestrian lanes.
      DK, LP: comments on the speed differential between pedestrians and bikes.
   Class 2: striped isolation of bike lane, but no hard barrier.
   Class 3: car/bike share same lane.
   Class 4: horizontal/vertical isolation of traffic and bikes.

   Recommends: Class 4 cycle track: Gilman Dr., Regents Rd., Governor Dr. , Nobel Dr, Eastgate Mall, Executive Dr. , Miramar Road, and Genesee (added by community).

   LP: Class 1 bike path from UCSD to the 56 would be optimal. DK concurs.

PV: Discuss Tools for a better bike experience at intersections.

CB: Mobility – Transit
   Look at demand: MTS ridership data and the experience quality of each transit stop.
   Look at safety around transit stops, particularly for pedestrians and bikes since they are
      first/last mile for a majority of trips.
   Possible network solutions discussed as well: Trolley extension, skyway, Sorrento Valley
      Station relocation.
   BB: How much coordination between City and UCSD?

CB: Always working on integrating plans.
AW: Skyway? Is there any way to provide public feedback?
CB: Yes: Vision center, 2nd floor, info later.
Public: Last mile?
CB: Did studies of last mile around Mid-Coast stops being constructed.

CB: Reviewed SANDAG 2021 regional plan.
Reviewed Mid Coast Mobility Hub Implementation Strategy.

CB: Transit tools:
Transit priority treatments (busses that send signals to traffic signals).

CB: Mobility – Vehicular

Counting during peak periods, calculating ADTs.
KR: When were counts done?
CB: 2015, 2016, 2017, some with UCSD. Construction makes this difficult.
2015 was most thorough, so good for analysis prior to construction.
Most intersections D, E, F during peak.

Look at safety with 13 locations of concern.
Look at Parking: Peak period strategies

CB: Vehicle Network Strategies.
Tools: Flex lane: Changes with need, could be for busses, parking.
Roundabouts, Adaptive Signals.
Curbside management (Lyft, Uber, micromobility, etc).

CB: Coordination: SANDAG, DSD, Transportation & Storm Water, UCSD, Caltrans, MTS.
Timeline: Existing Conditions document is available now (April 2018 document).
Accepting comments about this document for the next 3 months.
Mobility Concepts Winter 2019/2020. This is TODAY's input.
Future Conditions: Fall 2020.
Traffic Impact Study Winter 2020/2021

FINAL RESULT: Mobility Element for the Plan Update

7:20   Item 1 INFO ITEM – Mobility Strategy BREAKOUT SESSION

Breakout session for work sheets on:
Planning for Pedestrians
Planning for Bicycles
Planning for Transit
Planning for Roadways

8:20   Item 1 INFO ITEM – Mobility Strategy Discussion follow up
DM: Closing questions?
JS: Do you think by 2021 we'll see roadway changes apart from UC Plan Update?

CB:	City funding may be able to implement some improvements prior to plan.

8:38	**Item 2 ACTION ITEM – Draft CPU Vision Statement**

Vision Statement (Revised):

AW:	Call the question for motion on:

Vision Statement:
A diverse and dynamic community with renowned higher education, healthcare, scientific research and technology institutions and businesses connected through a robust multi-modal transportation network to a vibrant mixed-use urban core and varied residential neighborhoods, which protects its unique natural habitat and canyon systems. The community includes distinctive neighborhoods on either side of Rose Canyon. The northern portion is envisioned as a center of education, employment, and healthcare with multi-family and single family residences, as well as regional and neighborhood shopping. The southern portion is envisioned as primarily single family neighborhoods, parks, local shopping, some multi-family housing, and a business park.

Vote:
Yes	**11**
No	**1 (MC)**
Abst.	**0**

9:00	Adjourned.